

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 15 and 18, and cancelled claim 11. The claim language is supported by the as-field specification and drawings, e.g., page 16, line 26 - page 17, line 3, and Figs 11B and 12. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 15 and 18 over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0088336 to Sakamoto et al. ("Sakamoto") in view of U.S. 6,777,684 to Volkov et al. ("Volkov"); the § 103(a) rejection of claims 8-9 and 12-13 over Sakamoto in view of Volkov, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0017313 to Menache ("Menache"); and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 10, 11, and 17 over Sakamoto in view of Volkov, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/024588 to Aksyuk et al. ("Akysuk").

Amended claims 15 and 18 recite, among other things, a reflection plate being deformable into a plurality of concave/convex portions.

Neither Sakamoto nor Volkov discloses or suggests the above feature. The Examiner relied on Aksyuk to teach the above feature missing in the combination of Sakamoto and Volkov. Office Action at page 3.

Aksyuk, however, in contrast to the claims, discloses at paragraph [0018] and depicts in Figs. 3A and 3B, that each reflection plate is deformed to produce no more than a single concave/convex shape. Akysuk does not disclose or suggest deforming its reflection plate into a plurality of concave/convex shapes.

Moreover, if a proposed modification to a prior art reference would render the reference being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no

suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. M.P.E.P § 2143.01(V).

Deforming Akysuk's reflection plate into a plurality of concave/convex portions would render it unsuitable for its intended purpose of functioning as a deformable mirror, which requires a single concave/convex shape, because a plurality of concave/convex deformation would destroy the plate's ability to reflect and act as a mirror.

It would not have been obvious, therefore, to modify the combination of Sakamoto and Volkov to include a reflection plate producing a single concave/convex shape, as taught by Akysuk, in order to obtain the above-mentioned feature, i.e., a deflection plate producing a plurality of concave/convex portions, as recited in amended claims 15 and 18.

Menache also neither discloses nor suggests the above feature missing in the combination of Sakamoto, Volkov, and Akysuk.

Since the cited references, viewed alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claims 15 and 18, amended claims 15 and 18, and their respective dependent claims, therefore, are not obvious over the cited references.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the rejections, and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 7, 2009

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871
(202) 408-4000